



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,891	03/20/2006	Bert Braune	502902-225PUS	3003
27799 7590 03/20/2009 COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP 551 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 1210 NEW YORK, NY 10176				
EXAMINER				
WILLIAMS, AARON				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2889				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/20/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/572,891

Applicant(s)

BRAUNE ET AL.

Examiner

Aaron Williams

Art Unit

2889

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/4/2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's amendment filed 12/04/2008. Claims 1-16 are pending and an action on the merits is as follows.

Information Disclosure Statement

The examiner Acknowledges the IDS is for case 11/572,891, and will be address accordingly.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-16 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of copending Application No. 10/574,026. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following:

Copending ('026) claim 1 contains all of the limitations of present claim 1 with the exception the alternative limitation of emitting the primary radiation in the UV radiation region. However, since the alternative feature of stated exception in present claim 1 is claimed in copending ('026) claim 1 that limitation does not patentably distinguish the two claims. Further the limitation "partially converts the radiation of the chip into green emission of dominant wavelength $\lambda_{\text{dom}}=550$ to 570 nm" of present claim 1 is inherently taught by copending ('026) claim because both claims teach the same phosphor formula and then green color range can be achieved.

Also, the second phosphor of the copending ('026) claim 1 is not excluded in the present claim 1 due to the fact that the present claim 1 uses the statement "comprising".

Copending ('026) claim 2 also contains all of the limitations of present claim 2.

Copending ('026) claim 3 also contains all of the limitations of present claim 3.

Copending ('026) claim 4 also contains all of the limitations of present claim 4.

Copending ('026) claim 5 also contains all of the limitations of present claim 5.

Copending ('026) claim 6 also contains all of the limitations of present claim 6.

Copending ('026) claim 8 also contains all of the limitations of present claim 11.

Copending ('026) claim 10 also contains all of the limitations of present claim 10.

Copending ('026) claim 12 also contains all of the limitations of present claim 8.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 1-3, 8-9, 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by US Patent 6,717,353 to Mueller et al, herein refer to as Mueller.

Regarding claim 1 Mueller disclose, **a green-emitting LED which is designed as a luminescence conversion LED (figure 1), comprising: a primary radiation source, which is a chip emitting a primary radiation in the UV or blue radiations region** (refer to lines 42 -58 column 2 where it is stated a light emitting device that is a Led that emits primary light of UV or blue radiations); **and a layer of a phosphor which is arranged in front of the primary radiation source** (refer to lines 52-56 of column 2) **and completely or partially converts the radiation of the chip into green emission of dominant wavelength $\lambda_{dom}=550$ to 570 nm** (The graph of figure 1 shows the emission spectrum of the green phosphor $Sr_{.96}Si_2N_2O_2:Eu_{.04}$ after excitation refer to lines 16-23 of column 2); **wherein the phosphor belongs to the class of the oxynitridosilicates, having a cation M and the empirical formula $M_{(1-x)}Si_2O_2N_2:D_C$, where D denotes a doping with divalent europium and where M comprises Sr as a constituent and $M=Sr$ alone or $M=Sr_{(1-x-y)}Ba_yCa_x$ with $0 \leq x+y < 0.5$ is used, the oxynitridosilicates completely or predominantly comprising the high-temperature-stable modification HT.** The general of

the green phosphor is given lines 16-23 of column 2 as $(\text{Sr}_{1-a-b} \text{Ca}_b \text{Ba}_c) \text{Si}_x \text{N}_y \text{O}_z \text{:Eu}_a$, wherein $a=0.002-0.2$, $b=0.0-0.25$, $c=0.0-0.25$, $x=1.5-2.5$, $y=1.5-2.5$ and $z=1.5-2.5$. The claimed subscripts of “x” is equivalent to the Mueller’s b, “y” is equivalent to Mueller’s c, “c” is equivalent to Mueller’s a. The claimed molar proportion of Si, O, and N all fall within the ranges of the prior art. Therefore the claimed green phosphor formula is clearly anticipated.

Regarding claim 2 Mueller disclose, **the LED as claimed in claim 1, wherein the Eu fraction makes up between 0.1 and 20 mol % of M.** Refer to lines 16-23 of column 2 where the range disclosed by Mueller is $a=0.002-0.2$ which represent the molar percentage which anticipates the claim range. Regarding claims 3 and 12 Mueller disclose, **the LED as claimed in claim 1, wherein Sr represents the majority of M and a proportion of M, in particular up to 30 mol %, is replaced by Ba and/or Ca.** In the lines 16-23 of column 2 where the ranges disclosed by Mueller of the variables b and c is from 0.0-0.25 molar percentage which anticipates the claim ranges.

Regarding claim 8 Mueller disclose, **the LED as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that wherein the green emission has a dominant wavelength in the range from 556 to 564 nm.** Line 33 column 3 and figure 8 anticipate this claim.

Regarding claim 9 Mueller disclose, **the LED as claimed in claim 1, wherein the primary radiation is completely converted.** Since the claimed chemical formula is completely anticipated by the prior art it is inherent that the primary radiation can be converted very efficiently. Refer to lines 35-43 of column 3 for further explanation.

Regarding claim 16 Mueller disclose, **the LED as claimed in claim 1, wherein a primary radiation has a peak wavelength of at least 380 nm.** Refer to Figure 1 where the excitation spectrum is shown.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 4-7, 10, 13-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,717,353 to Mueller et al, herein refer to as Mueller, and further in view of US Patent Grant Publication 2003/0094893 to Ellens et al., herein refer to as Ellens.

Regarding claims 4 and 13 Mueller disclose, **the LED as claimed in claim 1.**

But Mueller fails to teach **wherein a proportion of M, in particular up to 30 mol %, is replaced by Li and/or La and/or Zn.**

However Ellens teaches in paragraphs [0042], [0063] - [0065] that M can be La or Sr by there self and that those can be put in combination with host novel optical elements of $\text{Si}_2\text{O}_2\text{N}_2$ or SiAlO_3N . The novel hosts are very stable thermally and chemically and are of the same basic tetrahedral structure. The motivation to combine Ellens use of $\text{M}=\text{La}$ with the host lattice and dopant of Mueller to achieve, the predictable result, of different color hue and saturation.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made, to combine Mueller's host lattice and dopant with Ellens' $\text{M}=\text{La}$. Both the Ellens and Mueller are directed to the same problem sought to be solved (optimizing LED

phosphor) and to change the color hue and saturation of the phosphor emission spectrum of the LED.

Regarding claims 5 and 14 Mueller disclose, **the LED as claimed in claim 1.**

But Mueller fails to teach **wherein part of the SiN group in the oxynitridosilicates of formula $\text{MSi}_2\text{O}_2\text{N}_2$, in particular up to 30 mol %, is replaced by the AlO group.**

However Ellens teaches in paragraphs [0043] – [0044] and [0063] the replacement SiN group with the AlO group. The motivation to combine is provide in paragraphs [0063] and [0064] where it states the optically active materials of $\text{Si}_2\text{O}_2\text{N}_2$ or SiAlO_3N can be substituted for each other since both have the same basic tetrahedral structure and the amount of nitride shifts the color spectrum.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made, to substitute Mueller's host lattice with Ellens' host lattice. Both the Ellens and Mueller are directed to the same problem sought to be solved (optimizing LED phosphor) and the optically active materials can be substituted for each other since both have the same basic tetrahedral structure.

Regarding claims 6 and 15 Mueller disclose, **the LED as claimed in claim 1.**

But Mueller fails to teach **wherein a proportion of Eu, in particular up to 30 mol %, is replaced by Mn.**

However Ellens teaches in lines [0061] the co-doping of Eu with Mn^{2+} up to 4 times the amount of Eu which is more than 30 mol %. Ellens also provides motivation to combine in paragraph [0061] where he states the combination of co-doping allows for energy transfer to the co-dopant which will shift the peak emission characteristic.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made, to replace some Mueller's dopant with Ellens' dopant. Both the Ellens and Mueller are in the same field of endeavor (Light Emitting Devices) and are directed to the same problem sought to be solved (optimizing LED phosphor) and co-doping allows for energy transfer to the co-dopant which will shift the peak emission characteristic.

Regarding claim 7 Mueller disclose, **the LED as claimed in claim 1,**

But Mueller fails to teach wherein the primary emission has a peak wavelength in the range from 380 to 430 nm, in particular at least 380 nm.

However Ellens teaches **wherein the primary emission has a peak wavelength in the range from 380 to 430 nm, in particular at least 380 nm** refer to paragraph [0077]. Motivation to combine is to provide adequate energy to excite the phosphor to exhibit the full green color emission.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention made to combine Mueller's LED with Ellens primary emission range is to provide adequate energy to excite the phosphor to exhibit the full green color emission. Both the Ellens and Mueller are directed to the same problem sought to be solved (optimizing LED phosphor).

Regarding claim 10 Mueller discloses, **the LED as claimed in claim 1.**

But Mueller fails to teach wherein the chip is an InGaN chip with a peak emission wavelength in the range from 430 to 465 nm.

However Ellens teaches **wherein the chip is an InGaN chip (Figure 1, Chip (1), refer to paragraph [0084]) with a peak emission wavelength in the range from 430 to 465 nm.**

The motivation to combine is to provide adequate energy to excite the phosphor to exhibit the full green color emission.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mueller's LED with Ellens primary emission range is to provide adequate energy to excite the phosphor to exhibit the full green color emission. Both the Ellens and Mueller are directed to the same problem sought to be solved (optimizing LED phosphor).

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,717,353 to Mueller et al, herein refer to as Mueller.

Regarding claim 11, Mueller disclose, **the LED as claimed in claim 1, wherein the LED is dimmable**. It would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the LED can be dimmable by reducing the current input, as in accordance to needs.

Response to Arguments

The Amendment, filed on 12/04/2009, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner. Claim(s) 1-16 are pending in the instant application

Applicant's arguments, see page 7 section "Patentability of the Claimed Invention", filed 12/04/2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-11 under 102(c) and 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the previous rejection has been withdrawn.

However, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of US Patent 6,717,353 to Mueller et al., that teaches the features of the claimed invention.

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Williams whose telephone number is (571) 270-5279. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 7:00 to 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Toan Ton can be reached on (571)272-2303. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron Williams/
Examiner, Art Unit 2889

/Toan Ton/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2889

